## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI	ſΑ

MARY JULIET NG,

Plaintiff,

v.

US BANK TRUSTEE, NA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-04998-PSG

## ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

(Re: Docket No. 55)

The court has before it Plaintiff Mary Juliet Ng's application for a temporary restraining order to prevent Defendants U.S. Bank N.A. and Select Portfolio Servicing Inc. from proceeding with a foreclosure of Ng's home. 1 Ng admits that she refinanced the home in 2007 but has made no payments on the loan since 2010.<sup>2</sup> Ng nevertheless claims that Defendants cannot initiate a foreclosure because they have no interest in the deed of trust and because certain recorded assignments of Ng's deed of trust were invalid.<sup>3</sup> Because a party seeking a temporary restraining order must establish a likelihood of success on the merits, 4 the court examines whether Ng has made that showing.

Case No. 15-cv-04998-PSG

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Docket No. 55.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> *See id.* at 16.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *See* Docket No. 45 at ¶¶ 8-19.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); DISH Network Corp. v. FCC, 653 F.3d 771, 776-77 (9th Cir. 2011). These cases involve preliminary injunctions, but the standard for temporary restraining orders is the same. See Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush & Co., Inc., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001); Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Inc. v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 887 F. Supp. 1320, 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995).

## Case 4:15-cv-04998-KAW Document 63 Filed 04/22/16 Page 2 of 2

Northern District of California United States District Court

Although Ng's complaint alleges eleven causes of action,<sup>5</sup> her application focuses on just one: wrongful foreclosure.<sup>6</sup> After reviewing the papers and considering the parties' arguments at today's hearing,<sup>7</sup> the court cannot say that Ng is likely to succeed on the merits of her wrongful foreclosure claim. The reason is that, under California law, a plaintiff may not bring a preemptive action for wrongful foreclosure before the sale takes place.<sup>8</sup> This is precisely what Ng has done.

The application for a temporary restraining order is DENIED.

## SO ORDERED.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated: April 22, 2016

United States Magistrate Judge

2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *See id.* at ¶¶ 24-120.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In her application, Ng does reference her other claims. But she offers nothing to meet her burden of establishing that she is likely to succeed on any of these claims.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Docket No. 62.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Saterback v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., 199 Cal. Rptr. 3d 790, 795-96 (Ct. App. 2016); Rossberg v. Bank of America, N.A., 219 Cal. App. 4th 1481, 1493 (2013); Lawrence v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Case No. 14-cv-01272, 2014 WL 2705425, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2014).